

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/655,166	09/05/2000	James Alan Hedrington	1850.292USD1	8174
75	90 09/05/2002			
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 2903 Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903			BECKER, DREW E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	13
			DATE MAILED: 09/05/2002	10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		72-13			
,	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/655,166	HEDRINGTON ET AL.			
·	Examin r	Art Unit			
	Drew E Becker	1761			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 21 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to available rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action: or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even in					
imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	CFR 1.704(b).	,			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) _ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>22 and 23</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
					8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:					

Jus Bech 2-2602

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that neither reference teaches cooking pizza... without an appliance as large as the pizza itself". However, this limitation is not claimed. Claim 22 recites "the housings covering only a porion of the food support member". The word covering was defined as "to spread over" in Merriam Wbster's Collegiate Dictionary. It is noted that the claims do not recite any limitation regarding the size of the lower housing since it is beneath the food support member and therefore cannot cover it. Applicant also argues that neither reference teaches cooking a "pizza by heating only a portion of the pizza at a time". However, attention is drawn to Figure 7, # 60 of Lang et al which clearly illustrates a heating element which cooks "only a portion of the pizza at a time".

KEITH HENDRICKS PRIMARY EXAMINER